

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/069,523	ISHIOKA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Timothy J. Dole	2858	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Timothy J. Dole. (3) Anjan Deb.
 (2) Tom Brown. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 May 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 6, 8.

Identification of prior art discussed: Sofferman

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See below

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Discussed claim 1 with respect to the 102 rejection & the positioning & structure of the claimed elements. Also discussed limitations of claims 6 + 8 with regard to the elements of Sofferman. Agreed to update rejection and possibly amend claims to overcome present rejection.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

RTM
 Examiner's signature, if required